SOME NEW BOOKS. SECOND NOTICE.

The second volume of John Sherman's Recol sctions of forty years in the House, Senate, and Cabinet, published by the Werner Company period from the beginning of Hayes Administration to the winter of 1894-95. Much of this volume, as of its predecessor, i devoted to an exposition of the financial history this country during the author's long publi life. This is a subject which ought to be separately considered, and we pass over it in the present notice, touching only on some of the ineresting things which Senator Sherman has to tell us about political events and personalities.

Among these may be mentioned the investi-gation of the New York Custom House, which was made while the author was Secretary of the Treasury, the Presidential campaign of 1880. the Conkling-Platt controversy with President Garfield over New York appointments, the Presidential campaign of 1884, the author's failure to secure the nomination for the office of Chief Magistrate in 1888, the second election of Mr. Cleveland to the Presidency, and the causes of the subsequent Republican victory throughout the Northern States.

Mr. Sherman says that, when the inquiry into the state of things prevailing in the New York Oustom House was made in the spring of 1877. there was no purpose or desire on the part of Mr. Hayes, or any one, to make a change in the principal offices. To prove this he cites his own letter to Collector Arthur. The report of the Commission which undertook an examination contained specific charges against persons employed in the Custom House. The Commission found that, for many years past, the view had obtained, with some politicians, that the friends of the Administration in power had a right to control the customs appointments, and that this view had of late been recognized to what the Commission deemed an undue extent, by the chief officers of the service. These gentlemen seem to have assumed that they were relieved, in part at least, from the responsibilities that belonged to the appointing power. The result of this, and subsequent reports to the same effect, was that Mr. Hayes, on Aug. 31, 1877, announced his desire to make a change in the three leading offloes of the New York Custom House, those, namely, of Collector, Surveyor, and Naval Officer. Mr. Sherman, who was Secretary of the Treasury, was requested to communicate with ers, in the hope that they would resign and thus relieve Mr. Hayes from the unpleasant necessity of removing them. The officers, not unnaturally, caused it to be understood that they did not wish to be removed pending the investigation, as it would seem that they were personally chargeable with the defects and irregularities which they themselves had pointed out. Mr. Sherman says that Mr. Hayes was willing to base his request for their resignation, not upon the ground that they were guilty of the offences charged, but that new ofcould probably deal with the reorganization of the Custom House with more freedom and success than the incumbents. From a letter quoted it is evident that the consulship at Paris was offered to Mr. Arthur and declined. It soon became manifest that neither he nor his colleagues had any intention of resigning, and that Senator Conkling intended to enter on a political contest against the policy of civil service reform inaugurated by Hayes. on Oct. 24, 1877, Hayes sent to the Senate the nominations of Theodore Roosevelt, Edwin A. Merritt, and L. B. Prince to succeed, respectively, Mesars. Arthur, Sharp, Cornell, all of them were reject ed at Mr. Conkling's request. On the 6th of December the same nominations were again submitted, and Messra. Roosevelt and Prince were again rejected, but Mr. Merritt, proposed for Surveyor, was confirmed. There the matter rested until July 11, 1878, when Hayes gave a temporary commission to Edwin A. Merritt, as Collector, to succeed Chester A Arthur, and to Silas W. Burt to succeed Cornel as Naval Officer, and these gentlemen entered upon the duties of their respective posts. On the reassembling of Congress in the following December it became neces sary to send these nominations to the Senate. Mr. Sherman tells us that he had definitely made up his mind that, if the Senate again rejected them, he would resign. He would not hold an office when his po litical friends forced him to act through unfriendly subordinates. The knowledge of this fact undoubtedly turned the scale in favor of the nominees, for the matter was decided against Conkling, after a struggle of seven hours in the Senate, through the confirmation of Merritt and Burt by a decisive vote. We ob serve that, in his accounts of this affair, Mr.

Grant at the Republican Convention in Chicago in 1880 as a candidate for a third term for the Presklency. Mr. Sherman points out that Grant's friends essayed to answer the popular objection against the third term by the fact that a term had intervened since he last held the office. Mr. Blaine was also an avowed candidate, and Mr. Sherman's name was mentioned, and it was generally supposed that one of the three would be the nominee of the Con-"I soon found," says the author, that the fact that I held an office (that of cretary of the Treasury) which compelled me to express my opinions was drawback rather than a benefit, and, while I had the natural ambition to attain such a distinction, I was handleapped by my official position." Nevertheless, "the idea was that, in a certain contest between Grant and Blaine, I might be nominated, in case either of them should fail to receive a majority of the wotes cast in the Convention." Mr. Sherman goes on to say that, "prior to the State Convention, I had an interview with Gen. Garfield which he sought at my office in the Department, and he there expressed his earnest desire to secure my nomination and his wish to be a dele gate at large, so that he might aid me effectively." He had been chosen, with little or no opposition, United States Senator, to fill the place of Sherman, whose term expired March 4. 1881. The Ohio State Convention had endorsed Mr. Sherman's candidacy, but it seems that, subsequently, "a few leading men whose names I do not care to mention, made a combination of those unfriendly to me and agreed to disregard the preference which the Convention had ex-Touching this matter, Gen. Garfield wrote to Mr. Sherman on May 10, 1880, about three weeks before the National Convention met: "I think it would be a mistake for us to assume a division in the Ohio delegation. We should, meet and act as though we were of one mind until those delegates who are hostile to you refuse to act with us, and, if we fall to win them over, the separation would be their act, not ours." This seems to have been bad advice, for. while the National Convention was perfecting its permanent organization, nine of the Ohio delegates announced their determination to vote for Blaine, in Mr. Sher-man's opinion this was "a fatal mismove for Blaine, and undoubtedly led to his defeat. Nearly four-fifths of the delegation were en favor of my nomination, in pursuance of the express wishes of the Ohio Convention, but they were all friendly to Blaine; and whenever i hould have become apparent that my nomination was impracticable, the whole delegation could easily have been carried for him without a division and thus have secured his nomina The action of the nine delegates who refused to carry out the wishes of the State Conention prevented the possibility of the vote of Ohio being cast for Mr. lilaine." On the final outcome of the Republican Convention of 1880, which was, of course, the selection new candidate and the nomination Garfield, the author makes the following observation: "It is probable that if received the united vote of the Ohio delegation I would have been nominated, as my relations with both Gen. Grant and Mr. my relations with both Gen. Grant and Mr. author proceeds to make some statements at case about it." It will be recalled blains were of a friendly character, but it is which have called forth vehement denials, but that, in the absence of a subsequent amend-

A chapter of special interest at this time !

'In time I became thoroughly advised of what courred at the Chicago Convention, and had entirely reconciled to the result, frequently afterward I heard cidents and details which occasioned me great pain, and which seemed to tablish the want of sincerity on the part of some of the delegates, intended to show that, for some time before the meeting of the onvention, the nomination of Gen. Garfield had been agreed upon. After its close I had numerous letters from delegates from other States complaining bitterly of the conduct of the Ohio delegation, and giving this as a reason why they had not voted for me. I was assured that large portions of the Massachusetts, Con-necticut, New Jersey, and other delegations had notified Gov. Foster that they were ready to rote for me whenever their vote was required, but no such request came from him. I was content with the result, but was deeply wounded by what I could not but regard as a breach of faith on the part of some of the Ohio delegation, and especially of Gov. Foster, who had been fully advised of my feelings in regard to his course." It appears that on June 23, 880, Mr. Foster wrote to Mr. Sherman for the purpose of answering the allegations that had een publicly made in regard to him, and explaining his conduct. Replying on June 30, in a letter here reproduced, Mr. Sherman says: " receive your frank statement with confidence will treat you as of old, and will give no furthe credence to the stories I hear." Nevertheless he tells his correspondent plainly what report had come to him, and on whose authority some of them were made: "It was distinctly stated to me by delegates and friends of delegates present in the Convention that they proffered the votes of large portions of their respective delegations to you, with the understanding that they were to be cast for me whenever you in dicated the proper moment. This was sp ally said as to Indiana, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and the Blaine portion of the Maine delegation. It is said that you prevented Massa chusetts from voting for me from about the tenth to the fifteenth ballot on Monday, that nine of the Connecticut delegates held themselves ready to vote for me on your call, but that you put it off, and Harrison is quoted as saying that twenty-six votes from Indiana were ready to be cast for me on Monday at any time after a few ballots, but they were withheld on account of representations from the Ohio delegation. Mr. Billings of Vermont is quoted as saying that the Vermont delegation, with two or three exceptions, were ready to vote for me, but were discontented with the position taken by you, and doubted whether you desired their vote for me." It appears that immediately after the election of Gen. Garfield to the Presidency Mr. Sherman received a letter from a Mr. Hudson of Detroit which expressed a fear that the President-elect was in serious danger of assas sination. Particulars were given. Mr. Sher man sent it at once to Garfield, and received from him, under date of Nov. 16, the following answer, which is memorable, in view of the tragedy that occurred the following summer: 'The letter of Mr. Hudson of Detroit, with your endorsement, came duly to hand. I do not think there is any serious danger in the direction to which you refer, though I am receiving what I suppose to be the usual number of threatening letters on that subject. Assassination can be no more guarded against than death by lightning, and it is not best to worry about oither." Touching the controversy between President

hardly worth while to comment on what might

was the subject of severe comment, and perhaps of unfounded suspicions of perfidy on the part of some of the delegates." Mr. Sherman adds:

. The course of the Ohio delegation

Garfield and the Senators from New York, concerning the appointments to Federal office in that State, Mr. Sherman remarks; "How far, if at all, the excitement of this contest led to the assassination of Garfield by Gulteau, cannot be known; yet, this tragedy occurring soon after , the popular mind connected the two events, and the horror and detestation of the murder emphasized the rejection of Conkling and Platt." Subsequently, in a paragraph recording the President's death, the author expresses the opinion that "in many respects Garfield was like Blaine, but in his personal intercourse with men, and in the power of will. he was not the equal of Blaine, while, in style of oratory, in imagery and expression, he was

III. In a chapter recounting the author's partici-

pation in the campaign of 1884, Mr. Sperman

otes that he was again talked of as a Republican candidate for the Presidency, but had, at that proached by personal friends I dissuaded them from using my name as a candidate. I neither asked nor sought any one to be a delegate, When the Convention met, the Ohio delegation Sherman refrains from reviving the specific | was divided between Blaine and myself, and charges of neglect of duty on the part of Ar- this necessarily prevented any considerable suport of me outside of the State for it. I regarded the nomination of Blaine as the natural result under the circumstances. Mr. Sherman goes on to say that "the strength that which deals with the presentation of Gen. of Arthur, his principal competitor, grew out of his power and patronage as President. He was a gentlemen of pleasing manners, but I thought unequal to the great office he held. He had never been distinguished in political life. The only office he had held of any importance was that of Collector of the Port of New York, from which he was removed for good causes, already stated. His nomination as Vice-President was he whim of Roscoe Conkling, to strike at Mr. Hayes. If nominated (in 1884), he would surely have been defeated. In the then condition of political affairs, it is not certain that any Republican would have been elected. It seems that the author was in Springfield Mass., when he "heard of the unfortunate remark of Dr. Burchard to Blaine about 'Rum Romanism, and Rebellion,' and felt that the effect would be to offend a considerable portion of the Irish voters who had been very friendly to Blaine. * * The election few days afterward, resulted in the success of the Democratic ticket. The electoral vote of New York was cast for Cleveland and Hendricks. It was believed at the time that this result was produced by fraudulent voting in New York city, but the returns were formal, and there was no way in which the election could be contested." We have heard that in the election referred to there was fraudulent voting, not only in New York city, but in States Island, in Long Island City, and in Gravesond, and that, in each of these localities, enough votes cast for Blaine or Butler were improperly counted for Cleveland to account for the latter' insignificant plurality in the State.

> In 1888, Senator Sherman was again a candilate for President, and, this time, with bright hopes of success. It had been settled early in he year that a large majority of the Ohio delegates would support him for President, and several weeks before the Convention was held it was announced that he would receive the unani mous support of the delegation from Ohio. The condition upon which alone he would consent come forward having been thus complied with, he felt that he might fairly aspire to the nomination. Mr. Blaine had declined it on account of his health, and no one was named who had a longer record of public service. Visiting the city of New York, however, in June, 1888 r Sherman became satisfied that he was unlikely to receive more than five or six of the votes of the New York delegation, as they were generally pledged to Mr. Depew. It was also eserted in the newspapers that Blaine would be nominated in spite of his declination, and the authority of a conspicuous citizen of Ohio was given for the statement. As a matter of fact, when the National Convention assembled, the Ohio delegation cast their entire vote for Sherman on all the ballotings except the last two or three, when one of the delegates voted for Harrison, who, we need not say, obtained the nomination. Senator Sherman says that his despatches from Chicago, where the Convention had met, led him to expect that, on Monday, June 25, 1888, he would be nominated, but it turned out that an arrangement had been made on Sunday that practically assured the nomination of Gen. Harrison. The

author proceeds to make some statem

which, so far as we know, have not been disavowed by the author of these volumes:
"From the best information I could gather
from many persons with whom I conversed,
I have no hesitation in expressing the
opinion that I was defeated for the nomination by New York. I was assured before the meeting of the Convention that I would have six votes at the outset from that State, and could reasonably hope for a large addition from that State in the progress of the balloting. Instead of this I did not receive a single vote from that State, although three or more of the delegates had been distinctly selected in my favor and had given pledges to their constituents that they would vote for me; but they did not on a single ballot do so, except, I was advised, that on one ballot one of them voted for me. I believed then, as I believe now, that one of the delegates from the State of New York practically controlled the whole delegation, and that a corrupt bargain was made on Sunday which transferred the great body of the vote of New York to Gen. Harrison and thus led to his nomination. It is to the credit of Gen. Harrison o say that, if the reputed bargain was made, it was without his consent at the time, nor did he carry it into execution." On another page we read: "I had no reason to believe that Gen. Harrison resorted, in the slightest degree, to any improper or corrupt combination to se cure his nomination." Another accusation has been vehemently repelled by the person implicated, and it is possible that we may see it withdrawn or modified in a new edition of this book. As it now stands, it amounts to a charge of bribery: "I believe, and had, as I thought, conclusive proof, that the friends of Gen. Alger substantially purchased the votes of many of the delegates from the Southern States who had been instructed by their conventions to vote for me." Elsewhere we read: "The only feeling of resentment I entertained was in regard to the action of the friends of Gen. Alger in tempting with money poor negroes to violate the instructions of their constituents."

When he comes to an account of the Presidential contest which took place in 1892, Mr Sherman notes that "a good deal of opposite to Gen. Harrison had been developed, mainly, think, from his cold and abrupt manner in his intercourse with those who had business with him. His ability and integrity were conceded. but he was not in any sense popular. . Many names were canvassed, mine among others. But I uniformly declined to be a candidate, and said that, if I had a vote in the Con vention, it would be cast for Harrison. Some of his friends, especially Charles Foster, complained in published interviews that I had not taken a more active part in securing his nomination. From later developments I became satisfied that Harrison could not be elected; that Platt and a powerful New York influence would defeat him if nominated. I therefore preferred the nomination of a new man, such as William McKinley, but he had committed himself to Harrison, and, according to my code of honor, could not accept the nomination, even if tendered him." We need not say that Harrison received the nomination. As late as September Mr. Sherman's observations led him to conclude that the people had confidence in Harrison, and that the general drift seemed to be in his favor. Toward the close of October, however, he noticed that, while the Republican meetings were large, the Democratio meetings were also large; that the personality of Cleveland and his autocratic command of his party were keeping it in line, while his firm adherence to sound financial principles, in spite of the tendency of his party to free coinage and irredeemable money, commanded the respect of business men, and was likely to assure to him the silent vote of thousands of Republicans. It is well known that the result of the contes was the reflection of Cleveland by a decisive majority. Mr. Sherman points out that Harrison did not receive the electoral vote of any one of the Southern States that were mainly respon sible for his nomination, nor of any one of the doubtful States of the North that contributed to that result, including Indiana, where he resided, and which went Democratic by a considerable plurality. On the other hand, as a rule, Blaine and McKinley gave Harrison their elec-

Among the observations with which the sec ond volume of Mr. Sherman's recollections ends. we should reproduce the interesting statement that " to the people of Ohio I owe all the offices and honors that have been conferred upon me No constituency could have been more forbearing and kind. During forty years of public life though many able men have aspired to the office I hold, the people of Ohio, through their General Assembly, have preferred me to represent them. Though my grateful thanks are due to them, and have been often expressed, yet I have felt, as they do, that my duty was to the whole country. Proud as I am Ohio, of its history and people, willing at all times to sound its praise in the sisterhood of States, yet, according to my convictions, the United States is entitled to my allegiance, and all parts of it should receive equal care and consideration. 'Our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country, has been the watchword and creed of my public life. It was the opposite doctrine of 'States' Rights,' allegiance to a State, that led to the civil war. It was settled by this war that we have a national government, limited in its powers by the Constitution of the United States fairly construed. Since that time our progres and development has been more rapid than any other country's."

Bufus King's Correspondence. The third volume of the Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, edited by his grandson, CHARLES R. KING (Putnams), covers the period from the early part of 1797 until November. 1801. The most important event which took placeduring these years, was President Adams's determination to send a new embassy to France to take advantage of what seemed to him an opportunity to settle the questions which had caused the rupture of amicable relations with the French Republic, and the annulment of the treaty with that country. The President hoped, through the instrumentality of the new commission, to restore harmony between two republican nations. As it is well known, this course was disapproved of by the Federalists generally, and specially by Alexander Hamilton. This and other causes led to a want of unanimity and of cooperation among them, and resulted in Mr. Adams's failure to be reclected to the Presidency. It is the history of this event which forms the subject of some of the most interesting letters addressed to Mr. King by his correspondents in the United States. It is these, and specially two or three letters from George Cabot, one of the most influential men in the Federalist party, to which we shall here direct attention.

It was on Aug. 0, 1800, that Cabot, in a letter to King, rouched on the Presidential contest then pending between the Federalist and the Republican parties. It will be remembered that the Federalists had nominated Adams of Massa. chusetts and Pinckney of South Carolina, while the candidates of the Republicans were Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr. After quoting the observation of a common friend that the separa tion of President Adams from his former coadjutors would detach from the Federalists many good men, Mr. Cabot says: "This is already verified; we have the unpopular side, and you know how few men are willing to be ranged on that side; I think, however, we are strong in our principles, patriotic in our views, and unanswerable in our arguments. The P. [Adams]. I am told, acts like himself; he sometimes praises us in strong terms; at others, he denounces us in a manner that outrages all decency. Although I shun politics as much as I can, and wish to avoid them altogether, yet you see I use the terms us and ur, for I am made one of the 'damned Faction' by the opinions l am known to maintain. In looking forward to the election of President there is obviously such a balance of advantages and disadvantages in each possible issue as to make one almost at ease about it." It will be recalled

ment of the Constitution, the electoral col-leges did not vote for Vice-President, but each of them named two candidates for President. There were, therefore, four possible issues of the contest then pending, but Cabot only contemplated three. At the date of this letter he did not dream that Burr might be elected, yet the latter came near securing the prize. The letter continued: "If Adams prevalls, it may be expected that he will persist in strengthening his popularity by sacrificing the old Federal cause, and all its advocates who shall have virtue enough to adhere to it, to their opponents; if Pinckney should be elected, he will have the cordial support of those only who are now detached from Mr. Adams; he will be but feebly supported by Mr. Adams's present adherents, and by many of them he will be abandoned, and probably opposed. If Jefferson is elected the Feder-alists will be reunited, and will be, perhaps, sufciently powerful to deter him from Jacobin ex cesses. On the whole, I see but one reason to wish strongly for the success of Pinckney, and that is that the true men will then be arrayed on the side of the chief of the nation, under the banner of the Constitution; they will be in the places where the wise and good ought always to b found, and, if they cannot do all the good they wish and the country needs, yet ultimately they will succeed there, if it is possible for them to succeed anywhere." Then ensues a passage which reminds us that the Federalists, although the Revolutionary war was but seventeen years distant, had become heartily reconciled to England, and retained not a spark of gratitude to France. "Meanwhile let us hope that, while we encounter these difficulties incidental to the nature of our Government, no nation which opposes the spirit of Jacobinism will contribute to its establishment here. This may be done or prevented in great degree by the policy G. B. [Great Britain] shall pursue. The blind antmosity of our people to G. B. is a powerful instrument for ambition to work with. Men who know its injustice will nevertheless use it, and if we engage in hostilities, the claimorers against G. B. will be the idols of popular worship, and those who have resisted this madness will be disgraced. It is so manifestly for the interest of G. B. to prevent, if possible, this disaster to the [Federalist] party here, whose policy must be always anti-Galilean, that it would seem to reflect on the sagacity of the

It is well known that the result of the election

British Cabinet to doubt their seeing it.

was that Adams and Pinckney were beaten, and that, Jefferson and Burr receiving an equal number of electoral votes the choice of Prestient had to be referred to the House of Representatives. George Cabot comments on the outcome of the contest in a letter to King dated Dec. 28, 1800; "You will see that Jefferson and Burr have a majority of three votes. The former will probably be chosen by the House if they are equal. This, at least, is my opinion, although many persons of good judgment think otherwise. It is taken for granted by many that the decided Federalists in high office will generally be dismissed, and their filled by Democrats. 1 do places think there will be many violent changes, if any; I only expect that if vacancies do happen, they will be filled with our opponents. In the mean time those of our friends who are in office will be a oneck on our fees, and will at least delay, perhaps avert, great mischief. You know my disposition to see things in a gloomy light, but I rather indulge this disposition when evils are before us than after they arise. In the present case I am far from being satisfied that our national affairs will essentially suffer. I think a President reputedly Federal [he means Adams] would have injured us more by defective administration than one of an opposite name; in the case of wrong policy by a Federal President the Federal party are, of conseuence, divided and broken, but under a President of an opposite character they re consolidated and strengthened by his bad conduct. On the other hand, if a Democratic President supports the existing system, he weakens the Democratic party. If the new resident attempts to tle us too closely to France, if, wantonly or unjustly, he exposes us to an unnecessary and rulnous war with England, if he disturbs public credit, he will reaninate and recombine with fresh zeal the whole Federal party against him, and, if he ferbears se will disappoint and divide his friends." Cabot adds: "We are all calm here: there is ess exultation on one side and much less depression on the other than you would imagine if you did not see the movements of men's hearts as well as listen to their words "

It is understood that Alexander Hamilton,

the exercise of his influence over Bayard of

Delaware, folled the plan of the Federalists to

make Burr the choice of the House of Repre-

sentatives for President. It appears, however, from a letter of Cabot, dated Jan. 28, 1801, that he concurred with Hamilton, unless an impossible contingency should occur. He writes "Jefferson and Burr have each seventy-three votes, and it is, as you well know, for the House o decide which shall be first. The Federalists. in general, are for Burr, and great efforts are making to secure his preference in the House. I think, however, they will not succeed, and I think they ought not, unless Burr will and Jefferron will not previously engage to uphold essentially the existing policy." The fullest account of the Federalist intrigue received by King was communicated in a letter from Sedgwick of Massachusetts in May, 1801. "You know." wrote Sedgwick, "my opinion of the two candidates, and it was not suddenly that I determined which to prefer. It was evident that Burr did not possess the confidence of his own party, and that he was selected as a candidate not from affection, but because it was supposed his influence was indispensably necessary to secure the votes of the electors of New York, which votes, it was foreseen, were essential to their success. When it was known that he had acquired an equal number of votes with Mr. Jefferson, the party did not conceal, nor attempt to conceal, their disgust and aversion. Of this Burr could not be ignorant, and hence it was believed that he would be sensible of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of administering the Government without Federal aid; and this he could not expect to receive without giving his support to the preservation of those systems which the Federalists thought necessary for the public prosperity. On the other hand, Jefferson was believed to be a sincere Democrat, hostile to the principles of our Constitution and the measures of the Administration, desirons of conforming in practice to the imbecile principles of the old Confederation, a Confederation whose measures would be directed by the arrogance of Virginia, aided by those States which looked up to her with servile submission. It was believed that he had given evidence of an entire devotion to France, under every form of her government, and that, under the dominion of this political passion, aided by a rancorous hatred to G. B. [Great Britain], he might involve the country in war with the latter, and, what is worse, form an intimate and subordinate connection with the former. We knew, possessing, as he did, the full confidence of his party, he had means, his rival wanted, to carry into effect mischievous designs which he entertain. On the other hand, Burr was secured against the evils resulting from local or personal attachment or aversion, being guarded by his selfishness against them. I cannot go into a detail of the reasoning which produced a unanimous determination among the Federalists of the House to support Mr. Burr. It would be still more beyond my power to give you intelligible relation of those untoward events by which our intentions were defeated; I am, indeed, restrained from doing it by other considerations than merely that the relation, by its length, would fatigue me and disgust you." Evidently, Sedgwick did not approve of the cours pursued by Alexander Hamilton which resulted in the election of Jefferson. Before quoting from this remarkable letter another paragraph with which we must take leave of the volume, we may remind the reader that Jefferson in his inaugural address evinced a most conciliatory | grants a separate absolution to each one of those spirit, declaring, "We are all Republicans, we

tude on the part of the incoming President is

prejudice and rancor of the Federalists were to remain long ineradicable: "The conciliatory speech of Mr. Jefferson at the time of his inauguration was the effect which the strong opposition made by the Federa-ists to his election produced from his timidity. When to him Burr was preferred by all, and when the greater part to last would risk every consequence rather than he should be President, he was sensible that the Federal mind contemplated that event with horror. Hence he was disposed to conciliate and to soothe; and hence he spoke of Federal measures and Federal men with respect. This disgusted, beyond expression, the leaders of his own party, because it gave the lie to all those slanderous misrepresentations by which his election had been secured. To reinstate himself in their good graces it was necessary to give serious proof of his attachment, and this he has done by the most violent removals from office which are lucrative to the Federal possessors, and filling them with Democrats. The wit of man could probably devise no measure more fitted to render party animosities incurable. This is 'healing the wounds of party divisions' without a witness." M. W. H.

The Confessional.

The first volume of A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church, by HENRY CHARLES LEA (Philadelphia, Lea Brothers & Co.), deals with the allied subjects of confession and absolution, the matter of indulgences being reserved for separate treat ment. The author's aim is to write a history and not a polemical treatise. For this rease he has abstained from consulting Protestant writers, and has confined himself exclusively to the original sources and to Catholic authorities. He has not restricted himself, however to standard theological treatises, but has felt himself at liberty to refer to popular works of devotion in which is to be found the practical application of theories enunciated by the masters of theology. It would not be easy to conceive of more powerful moral agencies for the exercise of influence than are provided by the practices of confession and absolution. They lie at the root of the power of the Roman Catholic Church, and consequently it is a service to historical truth which the author of this book has rendered by a minute examination into the origin and development of the sources of these practices. He reminds us also in a preface that the importance of the questions possed in review is by no means limited to the past, for in the Latin Church spiritual interests cannot be dissociated from temporal. Singularly blind, he thinks, must be the observer of events who falls to recognize the growth of influence that has followed the release of the Holy See from the entanglements consequent upon its former position as a petty Italian sovereign, and the enormous opportunities opened to it by the substitution of the rule of the ballot box for abso lutism. Through the instrumentality of the confessional, the sodality, and the indulgence, its matchless organization is enabled to concentrate in the Vatican a power greater than has ever before been wielded by human hands.

Auricular confession was unknown to the early Church, and the first eleven chapters of this book are allotted to an account of the proceedings by which the institution was established, and the methods of its operation were defined. We passover these chapters and come at once to a description of the confessional, as it now exists in the Roman Catholic Church. It is obvious that, when the Church had succeeded in establishing the necessity of sacramental confession, numerous questions of detail would spring up. The schoolmen were not remiss in defining what are the requisites of a confession that shall entitle the penitent to absolution. One of them contented himself with the three rudimentary conditions, to wit: Con trition, confession, and the intention to sin no more. Another advanced a step when he described valid confession as "bitter, speedy, complete, and frequent." By Thomas Aquina the qualifications of validity were expanded in a Latin quatrain wherein were enumerated all the points which he deemed requisite to the per fection of confession, though all were not pronounced essential. The full and faithful con fession of all mortal sins committed, and not as yet remitted, is the most essential requisite Full allowance, nevertheless, is made for the imperfections of human memory. Only what is confessed, or what is inculpably forgotten, can be the matter subjected to those who are deemed to hold the keys of heaven, and no pardon can be granted for a portion of the sins committed unless all are pardoned. There can be no partial reconciliation to God: the wilful omission of a single mortal sin renders the whole confession invalid and unsacramental. No amount of contrition and of lifelong penance, self-imposed, can wash away a sin thus concealed; every subsequent confession and communion is a fresh sin, and it were better for the penitent to live and die wholly without the sacrament. Many marvellous stories are recounted in exemplification of this doctrine. In a foot note, Mr. Lea refers to the largely quoted tale of a baptized Peruvian slave girl of dissolute life. who, on her deathbed, refused to confess her carnal sins, though she freely talked of them to others. She said that, when the priest came and urged her to confess, a black dwarf appeared on one side of her bed and prevented her from making a full confession, though St. Mary Magdalen, on the other side, adjured her to do

so. Her death was said to have been followed by terrifying evidences of her damnation. Like all other rules connected with the func tions of confession and absolution, the rule of completeness was subject to exceptions rendered indispensable by human weakness. Thus it appears that, if there is any danger to be anticipated from confession of sin to the parish priest, either because he is known to be a solleitor to evil and the sin may excite his lust, or if it be a wrong committed against him or any of his kindred that may prompt him to vengeance, or if he be known as a revealer of confessions, or if it be feared that he may make a bad use of the knowledge to the injury of others, and if no other licensed priest is accessible, the penitent may prudently suppress the portion exposing him self or the priest or a third party to risk, and trust to finding subsequently one to whom he may safely confide it. According to one authority. Henriquez, even shame justified suppression, especially on the part of women, and the confessor in such case might boldly absolve her, confiding in the mercy of God. In fine, as it was piously summed up by Domingo Soto, a prudent and element God does not require confession when it would involve grave peril. And, therefore, when there was reason to dread risk to life or to honor the sinner was not bound to confess. Modern theologians, however, insist much more strongly on the necessity of complete confession, irrespective of the consequences to others. In spite, however, of the rigid doctrines of these later theologians, doctrines that seem inevitable under the theory of absolution, Mr. Lea deems it reasonable to assume that imperfect confessions are by no means exceptional. Nor is it always the penitents who are to blame. A leading cause of imperfect confession is when there give due attention to each. Drowsiness or ignorance on the part of the confessor gives rise to perplexing questions. In a case of contagious disease the confessor can listen to a sin, and then hurriedly absolve the dying penitent. The enormous afflux of penitrats on certain occasions, eager to gain some attractive indulgence to which confession condition precedent, seems to render a full recital of sins in each case impossible. When one reads, for instance, of the crowds flocking to the Roman jubilees, one realizes how impracticable could have been any complete confession of the individual penitent. There is such a thing as gregarious confession, when the priest hears a multitude of penitents, and absolves them in blocks, in battle or shipwreck, or similar emergencies which may be unavoidable the Church accepts it as valid, and assumes that the formula "I absolve you from your sine" confessing. A reverse of this exceptional mode are all Federalists." Even this creditable atti- of absolution is what is known as divided confession. In the history of the so-called reserved viewed by Sedgwick with a jaundiced eye. The cases, the question naturally arose as to the

practicability of dividing a confession, making part of it to one confessor and part of it to snother. This is a point on which there has been considerable diversity of opinion and practice. In the earlier middle ages, such divided confessions were common, especially among loose women, who would confess their carpal sins to some priestly companion, and then their lighter transgressions to one in good standing, in order to enjoy the fair repute thence accruing, a species of hypocricy which some doctors of theology considered to be a mortal sin. while others classed it as vental. In modern practice we are told that there is nothing to prevent a penitent from confessing his mortal sins to a strange priest and getting absolution, and then his venials (which are not necessarily matter for confession and absolution) to his ordinary confessor, unless he does so for the purpose of avoiding reproof, and gaining fresh opportunity for sinning. It is a mortal sin, however, purposely to seek out an unknown and ignorant confessor to whom to confess the graver delinquencies; and dividing mortal sins between two confessors renders the confessions invalid unless there are sufficient reasons why some sins should not be revealed to the ordinary confessor.

The question whether written confessions are allowable is one as to which the custom of the Church has varied. A penitent, if there is sufficient cause, can write out the confess whole or in part, and hand it to the priest in the confessional, saying: "I accuse myself of all the sins which you read here." This, apparently, is sometimes done by women through ense of shame, and such a confession is accepted as oral; but the woman is, of course, subject to interrogation. Whether such a writing can be sent to a confessor and absolu tion be returned by messenger, has been the subject of some debate. The necessity, however, of presence in absolution is no longer disputed, though, according to Mr. Lea, it rests only on the utterance of Clement VIII. The definition as to absolution led to many nice speculations a to the distance which can intervene between priest and penitent without rendering the sacra ment invalid, some doctors holding that twenty paces are allowable, while others contend fo ess; also whether one must be able to see the other, or whether hearing suffices; also when from any cause, absolution is not given at the time of confession, how many days may elapse without affecting its validity. Modern science has recently raised a new question, the intro duction of the telephone rendering verbal com munication possible at a distance, but it has been decided that, though telephonic confes sion may be oral, the absolution would be given in absentia, and, therefore, would be invalid. When annual confession was enforced, there

was relatively little to be apprehended from lapse of memory, but more from conscious sun ression by unwilling penitents. Accordingly, the Lateran canon of 1216 was careful to pre scribe diligent investigation into all circum stances of sin as part of the duty of the confes sor. As enforced confession was gradually reduced to a system, the priest was instructed t interrogate the sinner seriatim on each of the precepts of the decalogue, the seven deadly ins, the abuses of the five senses, and the thoughts and lusts of the heart. No loophole was to be left through which the penitent could escape the search ing inquisition. Minute and suggestive lists were drawn up, hideous catechisms of sin, and though occasional cautions were uttered, recommending reticence, especially as to lapses of the flesh, virginal purity and innocence could be no safeguard against foul and indecent questions Women, evidently, were not expected to confess such matters willingly, so that inquiries had to be made to all, young and old; the usual instruction is to commence by asking about impure thoughts, and whether they give pleasure, and, if this is admitted, the interrogations can be pushed from one step to another. Under such a method contamination can scarcely be avoided at the hands of the most discreet of confessors, and, if he chance to be brutal or coarse-minded, the confessional ecomes a source of demoralization. In a foot note, however, the author testifies that the questions to be put to young persons of both sexes are decent in comparison with the interrogatories prescribed for married folk. The Roman ritual issued by Paul V., and still in use. while it recognizes the utility of interrogation, gives a wholeshme warning not to waste time in unprofitable and curious inquiries, nor by imprudence to teach sin to the innocent, and es pecially to the young of either sex.

By quotations from medieval authorities, Mr. Les shows that it has not been left to modern times to recognize the dangers attendant on interrogating the penitent. Casarius of Heister bach cited the case of a nun who was led into sin by the interrogation of her confessor and who was saved only by the intercession of the Virgin. A century later, Guido de Monteroquer spoke of frequent instances in which both men and women had been led by too curious an investigation into guilt of which they had previously known nothing. Savoronola's utterances indicate that salacious priests made use of the confessional to grope after the most prurient details. One very suggestive mode of teaching sin was a question used by ignorant priests; you should do this or that, would you confess it?" which the synod of Verdun, in 1598, forbade, and characterized as framed in the work shop of the devil. The Jesuit rule was prudent, if not strictly logical, the rule, namely, that it is better for the confessor to know less of the sins of his penitent than to create scandal for either party. Vinterim, while he maintains a discreet silence as to mediaval writers, observes: "Past ages present much which modern times have changed." The Council of Suchuen, in 1803, directed that no confession is to be heard without offering a preliminary prayer to God to be

preserved from infection if violations of the sixth commandment, which give rise to so many temptations, are to be listened to. The seduction of women in the confessional has always been a source of anxiety to the Church. That it was regarded as an everpresent probability is seen in the reiterated declaration that the parish priest, who was known as a "solicitor" to evil, forfeited his jurisdiction over women, who were then at liberty to seek another confessor, or, if this was not possible, even to omit confession altogether. Not only was the abuse stimulated by the templations and opportunities of the confessional, but it was virtually divested of all spiritual terrors for the woman by the assurance of pardon. The doctors of both the Dominican and Franciscan schools were unanimous in saying that a woman thus seduced ought not to confess to her paramour, and that he ought not to absolve her from their mutual sins, but that, nevertheless, if he did so, the absolution is good, the only objection against this doctrine being that it relieved the woman from the shame which is a wholesome concomitant of confession. Even after the outbreak of the Reformation, Bernal Diaz de Lugo argued that, unless married women or virgins are concerned, an illicit connection between a priest and a woman is only a qualified fornication; but are numbers to be heard and lack of time to that, as it was regarded with special horror by the people, gave a handle to heretics, and led men to keep their wives and daughters from the confessional, therefore the punishment should be severe in proportion to the extent to which the case had become known, and the scandal which it had caused In modern times energetic steps have been taken by the Church for the suppression of the evil of solicitation in the confessional, and the machinery of the Inquisition has been set in motion to that end. In lands where there was no Inquisition the Bishops were empowered to punish the offence, whether it was committed by the regular or the secular clergy. In 1745 Gregory XV, promulgated a decree inflicting perpetual disability of administering the cucharist upon all guilty of solicitation. Mr. Lea frankity admits that the Holy See has exhausted all the resources of its power, so far as legislation against abuses of the confessional is concerned, Whether the legislation is enforced must be a matter of conjecture, for scandal is now, as of old, the most dreaded of all things. It is suggested that, if solicitation were not regarded as a still existing danger, the Council of Venice in tion to that end. In lands where there was no

1859 would scarcely have enjoined on all con fessors to keep constantly before their eyes th apal decrees against it, nor would various other modern synods have deemed it necessary to re pent the prohibitions of absolving the accomplice in sin.

IV.

The danger of confessing women being recon

nized, it has always been the effort of th

Church to reduce, as far as possible, the peri

by regulations which could render the confer sion as nearly public as is consistent with the preservation of its secreey. In cases of sickness or other necessity confession can be heard in the house of the penitent; but then the cham ber door must be open and some one within sight, although not within carshot. Otherwisthe confession is ordered to be in the oper church, in some spot visible from around; I must be after sunrise and before sunset and, if the penitent is a female, then must be some one else in the church, or she is not to be heard; the confessor moreover, is directed to place her at his side, to avert his face, or gaze upon the floor, and on ne account to look at her. It was not until the Counter-Reformation had begun that the simple and useful device of the "confessional" was in troduced; a box in which the confessor sits with a grille in the side through which the kneeling penitent can pour the story of his sins into hi ghostly father's ear, without either seeing the face of the other. The Roman Ritual of 1614 orders the use of the "confessional" in al churches, and prescribes its position it an open and conspicuous place. We note finally, among the questions connected with the morals of the confessional one which has given rise to consider able difference of opinion, whether, namely, the penitent should mention, or the confessor should require him to reveal, the name of an accomplice in sin. In any case, as, for example, in that of robbery or crimes of violence, it is concelvable that knowledge thus obtained might be put to evil uses; but in the case of lapses of the flesh the temptation to a dissolute priest to take advantage of women whose weakness had come to his knowledge through the confession of their lovers, has been found to be peculiaris dangerous. Until the last century no authors tative expression of approval or condemnation was issued, and the matter was left to chance regulations of local synod the conflicting opinions of the doctors. Eventually the theologians were mostly agreed that it is a mortal sin to require the revelation of an accomplice withou reasonable cause. The definition, however, of reasonable cause was somewhat elastic. The amendment of the accomplice was not regarded as a justification, but the revelation could be compelled, if necessary to prevent the relapse of the penitent, or to ascertain accurately the grade of the sin. These exceptions gave coniderable latitude to evil-disposed priests, who could construe them as they saw fit with ignorant penitents. Finally, in 1745, Benedict XIV., in a brief addressed to Portugal, prohibited absolutely, as scandalous and pernicious, the custom of inquiring the name of the accom-plice; this did not suffice, and in the following year he subjected to the re-served excommunication all who should treat it as permissible. Even yet there were obstinate theologians who assumed that these decrees were restricted to Portugal, and that the practice was still allowable elsewhere; a third decree was, therefore, requisite, which the Pope issued three months later, declaring that the prohibition was general, and must be universally enforced. So stubbornly, however, was the evil upheld that a fourth utterance was necessary in 1749, placing in Portugal the offence under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. This settled the matter, so far as direct questions as to the name of an accomplice by the confessor are concerned, though even this would seem to be by no means cradicated, if we may judge from the necessity which several recent coun-cils have felt of still prohibiting it, and from the fact that Pius IX., in a bull, made special reference to the decrees of Benedict XIV., and confirmed the reserved excommunication of all who shall teach it to be lawful for the confessor to require a name. Even now the prohibition can be virtually eluded, for the confessor, if he sees fit, can ask questions which will enable him to identify the accomplice. Moreover, the weight of modern authority does not regard the danger of exposing an accomplice as relieving a

FAVORITE SONS.

A Feature of National Conventions Especially in Favor Among Republicans,

penitent from the obligation of confessing a sin.

Candidates nominated at National Conventions by the delegates of their fellow citizens. without any expectation that the Convention will rregard thei claim favorably, have come to be known among politicians of both parties as favorite sons. But it is a fact that favorite and at Republican Conventions than among Democrats, who, in the larger States at least, are seldom united in favor of any candidate has the sentiment of local pride as his chief recommendation. In the National Republican Conventions of 1864, 1868, and 1872, there were no favorite sons, for the nomination in

each Convention was unanimous. . In 1876, among the minor candidates were John F. Hartranft, the favorite son of Pennsylvania, who received its support for six ballots, and Marshall Jewell of Connecticut, who received the support of his State for one ballot, In the 1889 Convention there were three favorite sons, neither of whom cut any serious figures in the balloting, after a complimentary vote had been cast. They were William Windom of Minnesota, E. B. Washburn of Illinois, and George F. Edmunds of Vermont. In the 1884 Convention Joseph R. Hawley of Connection was the only favorite son, and in 1888 there were Allison of Iowa, Depew of New York, Rusk of Wisconsin, Ingalis of Kansas, Edwin Fitler of Penn sylvania, then Mayor of Philadelphia and William Walter Phelps of New Jersey. After the third ballot (there were eight ballots n all) Allison was the only one of these herad of. In the Republican National Convention of 1892 there were no favorite sons.

Favorite sons in Democratio National Con-Favorite sons in Democratio National Conventions have not been very favorably regarded since 1808, when nearly each State had its own favorite: Pendleton of Ohio, English of Connecticut, Packer of Pennsylvania, Parker of New Jersey, Doollitie of Wisconsin, Adams of Massachusetts, and Stephen J. Field of California, In 1876 the Ohio Democrats tenaciously supported William Allen, former Governor of that State, and the Missouri Democrats James O. Broadhead of St. Louis, afterward United States Minister to Switzerland. In 1880 the Illinois Democrats voted for William R. Morrison, but the other States were badly divided in their preferences, Pennsylvania having two candidates, Samuel J. Randalland Winfield S. Hancock, and Ohio three candidates. Henry R. Payne, Allen G. Thurman, and Thomas Ewing. The failure of the Ohio delegates to unite on any of the three probably led to the loss of the communition by the Buckeye men; at least such was the judgment of many impartial Democratic observers of that Convention proceedings. In 1884 the Democratic Observers of that Contucky, while the votes of Indiana were recorded in favor of Joseph E. McDonald of Indiana, and these of Ohio for Allen G. Thurman of that State. In the last Democrate Convention, that of 1892, Horace Roles had the solid support as a favorite son of the Democrate Convention, that of 1892, Horace Roles had the solid support as a favorite son of the Democrate Convention, that of the Kentucky delegation in the Kentucky delegation.

The support of favorite sons has been generally popular amorg politicians, for, besides enabling the delegates of a State to pay a desirable compilmentary votes have been east on the first or preliminary ballots and to accombine affect to real preferences. There are plemty of favorite sons have been east on the first or preliminary votes have been east on the first or preliminary votes have been east on the first or preliminary votes have been east on the first or preliminary votes have been east on the first or preliminary votes hav ventions have not been very favorably regarded

Did the Bird I se an X Hayt